IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN RE: GRAND JURY SUBPOENA OF MATTHEW COOPER

. Docket No. MS 04-296

. Washington, D.C. . August 6, 2004

TRANSCRIPT OF MOTION HEARING
BEFORE THE HONORABLE CHIEF JUDGE THOMAS HOGAN
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

For the Government: Jim Fleissner, Esquire

Patrick Fitzgerald, Esquire

Office of the United States Atty.

Office of SpecialCounsel Dirksen Federal Building 219 South Dearborn Street,

Fifth Floor Chicago, Illnois

For the Defendants: CAHILL GORDON & REINDEL

Floyd Abrams, Esq.

Joel Kurtzberg, Esquire

Of Counsel: Robin Bierstedt

Time Inc.

1271 Avenue of the Americas

New York, N.Y.

Court Reporter: Cathryn J. Jones, RPR

Official Court Reporter

Room 4808A, U.S. District Court

333 Constitution Ave., NW Washington, D.C. 20001

Proceedings recorded by machine shorthand, transcript produced by computer-aided transcription.

THE COURT: All right. Call the case, please.

THE DEPUTY CLERK: This is In Re: Special Investigations MS Number 04-296. Parties come forward and identify yourselves for the record, please.

MR. FITZGERALD: Good morning, Your Honor.

Patrick Fitzgerald, Special Counsel joined by Jim

Fleissner, Deputy Special Counsel. Also in attendance
is Special Agent Jack Eckenrod of the FBI.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

MR. ABRAMS: Good morning, Your Honor. I'm Floyd Abrams. Sitting in back of me at counsel table is Matthew Cooper of Time magazine. Across the table is Joel Kurtzberg of my firm and Robin Bierstedt for Time, Inc.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

This matter is before the Court on a motion of the government for entry of a show cause order which I had granted. And then today is the hearing why the witness should not be been held in contempt of court. I asked Mr. Cooper to be here personally, he is and I appreciate that.

I received last evening, although I thought the agreement was we'd get it on Wednesday, the response of Mr. Cooper and the attached affidavits of

various individuals involved in this type of activity of the reporting nature, the reporter's privilege exceptor. I have not read all the cases cited since I got this about 5:30 last night.

I want to raise with the parties one issue that concerned me resulting in an experience I had here several years in the Circuit. And that is the agreement that Mr. Cooper would not have to appear and actually refuse to answer any questions before the Grand Jury because they have agreed between counsel and Mr. Cooper that he would not answer questions. And so they would proceed more traditionally by this hearing today on the premise that he would not answer questions.

Looking at the 1826 under Title 28, and I read it through. It says that, "Whenever a witness in any proceeding to a Grand Jury refuses to without just cause to comply with an order of the Court to testify the Court upon such refusal," and maybe this is enough, "or when such refusal is brought to its attention may summarily order its confinement," et cetera. Which seems to envision that the witness must actually have refused to testify in this Grand Jury.

And that, and I have to find there's no valid basis for refusal to testify. With the subpoena

I ordered the witness to comply which I have. And the witness disobeys that order by refusing to testify. I just want to make sure that the parties are saying that that is an appropriate approach by having an agreement not to testify as opposed to actually appearing and refusing to testify.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Your Honor, I might may MR. FITZGERALD: I understood Mr. Abrams make two suggestions. represented, and I obviously fully trust that representation, that he had talked to his client who indicated he would refuse to testify to the appropriate questions. The two alternatives if we wanted to make it rock solid, we do have Grand Jury time available this afternoon. We can go in and I think probably in one question ask the question that I understand from Mr. Cooper's representations that Mr. Abrams would refuse to testify. Or the Court would ask Mr. Cooper now as this is a civil proceeding would he answer a question and he could state his intent to refuse --

THE COURT: I intend to do that at least.

My concern was I had a case several years ago

involving privileges, different privilege and massive

documents that, and the parties needed the privilege

issue resolved before trial. And the documents were

multiple, multitude of documents. And the parties stipulate that I could make a generic ruling on whether this privilege would attach to the documents or not, although some documents may not cover the privilege, but they needed an immediate ruling. And I did so by agreement. It was appealed. New counsel came in for the losing side and said there had to be an individual document viewing. The Circuit agreed with that and sent it back down despite the original agreement of the parties.

I did not want to see anybody lose time by when the Circuit was set. This was just a prospective refusal not a real refusal. Make sure we have a case that the parties are satisfied, can raise the issues as they want it raised in the time frames they have without wasting time. That's all. I'm not opposed to accepting the stipulation. I just want to lay it out for the parties and make sure they're satisfied with it.

MR. FITZGERALD: I appreciate that. We were trying as well not to go through needless steps, but we certainly don't want to go through an appeal and turnaround and come back. I might suggests that either we could have mister, if Mr. Abrams is comfortable with it, Mr. Cooper state that if he were

asked a question about any confidential conversations he had with the identified branch official, off-the-record conversations concerning the topic matter of whether he'd answered the question. then since I do have Grand Jury time at one o'clock if, assuming parties are available I could ask that simple question this afternoon. And presuming that he refuses to answer we could report that back to the Court if we wanted to be extra safe.

THE COURT: I think at least today and I'll hear from Mr. Abrams on his advice about it as well, I can consider the, the contempt go on and make a decision on that. And if there's, parties agree to tie that down and have Mr. Cooper go before the Grand Jury and refuse to answer at one o'clock, that's fine. But I just want to let the parties know the reading of the statute in which my powers is vested pretty clearly states I think contemplates a refusal to answer on such refusal or when a refusal is brought to its attention whether the stipulation the parties are satisfied carries the weight they want. I'm willing to go forward. I just thought we should just look at that. Abrams.

MR. ABRAMS: Good morning, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Good morning.

24 25

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MR. ABRAMS: When Mr. Fitzgerald raised with me the possibility of doing this by stipulation it did seem to me, it does seem to me particularly with Mr. Cooper here in court to affirm if that's necessary that he would refuse to answer the question that Mr. Fitzgerald just placed on the record. I think that should suffice. I think my saying should also and it will preclude me from saying anything contrary to that in the Court of Appeals. Put it differently, I am not going to argue in the Court of Appeals that that part of Section 1826 has not been met. So I think that such refusal has been brought to your attention.

THE COURT: That's fine. I think what I'll do is ask Mr. Cooper on the record here and proceed.

MR. ABRAMS: Shall we do that now, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Cooper, I'll ask you to come up to the podium here if you don't mind, sir, make a court appearance. Would you identify yourself for the record, please.

THE WITNESS: Sure. My name is Matthew Cooper.

THE COURT: All right. And you're the Matthew Cooper the order is outstanding against to

show cause why you shouldn't be held in contempt for refusing to testify before the Grand Jury on areas concerning the off-the-record or confidential conversations you may have had with people in the executive branch about a subject matter this Grand Jury is investigating?

THE WITNESS: That's correct, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. And I've been given a stipulation to understand that you have and would refuse to answer any questions about that subject matter, about confidential off-the-record information you may have before the Grand Jury; is that correct?

That's correct, Your Honor. THE WITNESS: want to try to get my process going. Yes, that's true, Your Honor. Yes.

THE COURT: All right. I'm going to find that you have been brought to my attention under 28 U.S.C 1826 that you have refused and will continue to refuse to answer questions propounded by the Grand Jury or the Special Counsel before the Grand Jury as to the area in which they're investigating that this matter concerns and the subpoena concerns that you're brought in on.

> All right. Thank you, Mr. Cooper. THE WITNESS: Thank you.

24

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

of this matter and the legal standard as to the recalcitrant witness statute. I read through the brief just submitted as to the type of discretion I have not to find Mr. Cooper in contempt or if I do, impose a fine rather than imprisonment or stay any imprisonment order such as the decision of the Court.

And, Mr. Abrams, you want to expand on that now?

MR. ABRAMS: Yes, Your Honor. Let me say first that I apologize if there was any misunderstanding as to when our brief would be filed. I had understood it was Wednesday or Thursday; therefore, I chose Thursday.

As Your Honor sees from our brief there's no disagreement on the facts of this situation. Your Honor has entered an order. Mr. Cooper has advised you that consistent with what he understands the law to be and his journalistic principles that he cannot obey it and he has not. What we have argued as you have seen in our brief, very briefly, that Your Honor has a level of discretion about what to do today in a variety of ways.

Obviously, you have the power to find Mr. Cooper in contempt. There was an order, he did

not obey it. You also have we think the power to determine not to if you should decide that in the exercise of your discretion you think you need not or ought not do that. We have devoted as you've seen most of our brief, almost all of our brief, to what happens if you should decide to hold Mr. Cooper in contempt.

2.3

And we really said broadly two sorts of things which I would preface by just saying this. I want to be clear that I don't represent a criminal defendant here today. This is a civil contempt proceeding against someone that's never been in trouble and that has only and honorably served the public by his journalistic efforts, that he finds himself in a situation in which his journalistic commands at their best are at least at tension with and perhaps in conflict with Your Honor's rulings.

And so his answer and our answer is we intend to appeal. And the only way we can appeal is for the, the witness to decline to answer the question as he has attested to today. We thought hard and then learned what the law was about whether we could even ask you to certify this without a finding of contempt and we can't, so that option is simply not open.

So the bulk of our argument then was and is

that this case should in a sense be teed up for the Court of Appeals. We have agreed as you've seen in the paper if Your Honor were to order incarceration that counsel have agreed on bail and therefore that he would not now be incarcerated. And that a schedule would be advocated by me to the Court of Appeals which should result in a prompt disposition by that court basically.

The stipulation that we've agreed to is that if you were to find him in contempt and order incarceration today I'm sure that the same thing with somewhat different words would apply with respect to a fine is that I would move by Tuesday, I would file a notice of appeal by Tuesday and move on that day for an expedited appeal seeking a briefing schedule where we would file our brief in 12 days after the Court of Appeals entered the order. They would file theirs seven days thereafter. We would file our response three days thereafter and then whatever argument the Court of Appeals set would then occur.

The burden of what I have to say to you today if you should hold him in contempt that you ought to do what we think most judges have done which is to impose a fine rather than incarceration.

Obviously, if it's stayed, if it's a fine I guess the

word is stay. And if it's incarceration the word is bail as I understand it, but it amounts to the same thing. If it is stayed or bail is agreed upon as counsel have then the practice truth there wouldn't be difference between the imposition of the sanction if you weren't opposing it.

But we have seen that in cases which raise this very issue involving journalists, again and again District Courts have and when they haven't the Court of Appeals have not only granted the stay but imposed some modest fine often a dollar a day. Counsel for the, Special Counsel has argued that that would be a symbolic fine. That's true. A dollar a day is nothing but a symbolic fine. Obviously if we were to lose in the Court of Appeals Your Honor could revisit the issue of the amount of the fine or incarceration if it comes to that.

The reason I think I cannot tell you the other courts that have done this have explained why they did a dollar a day. But the reason they've done a dollar a day I believe is a different sort of symbolism. And that is that they understand win or lose whatever the law may turn out to be when journalists act in good faith consistent with their professional norms and indeed consistent with some

significant body of case law albeit one that judges have sometimes rejected as you have, that they ought not to be incarcerated. And that if the Court of Appeals can have before it the case in that same form with a fine, and a small fine that that should be done.

Now the argument has been made by Special Counsel that our cases are not Grand Jury cases.

Section 1826, of course, relates to trials and Grand Jury. There's no difference there.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. ABRAMS: And they've argued that many of our cases don't involved individual journalists as opposed to corporate entities like Time, but the Cutler case does indeed involve individual journalists as well as corporate entities. And there was a gross fine there of a dollar a day. I think the reality is a lot of judges recognize this is a hard question. And that it is not by any means nullable in advance what the Court of Appeals may do.

So we ask you then to impose a fine rather than to order incarceration. We certainly ask you to accept the stipulation of counsel whatever you do with respect to fine or incarceration, and that we'd be as it were sent on our way upstairs to see what happens.

I think all of us understand that and Mr. Cooper understands the importance of abiding by law. He is not a law breaker. He's not a contumacious person. To have this case heard on appeal he simply has to take the step that he has announced today. And so on that basis we urge the Court to act as I have urged on you today. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Abrams.

Appreciate the work. Mr. Fitzgerald.

MR. FITZGERALD: Yes. Good morning, Your Honor. Let me just make sure that Your Honor -- first, I apologize. Our brief was served Monday, but wasn't filed Tuesday because of some delays. And secondly, I hope I made clear I understood when we filed Monday that Mr. Abrams would file Wednesday or Thursday. Lastly, I want to make sure you received our brief yesterday.

THE COURT: Got it.

MR. FITZGERALD: Okay. To be perfectly, Your Honor, blunt we're trying to strike a balancing ourselves. We recognize that there are important First Amendment media interests and there also are very important investigative interests. And in looking at the situation Mr. Cooper is not being

investigated for any wrongdoing. He's being questioned as a witness for doing his job. And at a certain point we feel the law is clear that he has to comply with the lawful obligations. And we think that Your Honor was right on the law. And we think also that as a matter of fact, we've exceeded whatever standard we need to satisfy to show that his testimony is necessary.

2.5

Having said that, I don't want to be in a position of asking Your Honor to do something that we don't think is appropriate. We understand that Mr. Cooper and Time magazine in this case wants to make sure that D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals agrees with Your Honor. And so what we're trying to do is accommodate that important interest, accommodate his right to be heard and Time's right to be heard, and the D.C. Circuit's opportunity to review this decision while not prejudicing our investigation.

We'd like to move this forward. And we do not wish to see Mr. Cooper sit in jail for vindicating a right however strongly we disagree with his legal view. We want to make sure that everyone we understand that this is a proper procedure. And so what we discussed with Mr. Abrams was putting ourselves in a position where we're not prejudiced

time wise and Mr. Cooper doesn't suffer in jail to have heard by the Court.

So looking past what is a legal standard without getting to our view that we think we're clearly right on the law, what we wanted to do is be in the same position as if Mr. Cooper was jail without him being there. That's why -- and I think the, one thing I want to make clear we understood that Mr. Abrams would file a notice of appeal within 48 hours, but that means two business days. Our paper said Monday, we meant Tuesday if Your Honor had entered an order today. Then thereafter the schedule would be as if it would be resolved in 30 days as the statute provides if someone is in jail.

The one thing I think I need to straighten out with Mr. Abrams, I understood that we would propose an order where their brief would be filed within 12 days of the notice of appeal. It wouldn't wait for 12 days for the D.C. Circuit to order the schedule because that would lose some time. Getting past the scheduling matter we think that would be the fair balance that would allow us to proceed. We're relying upon that to take the position that this is not an appeal taken for delay. We think that's the proper balance to say.

Having said that, I think it's very important that the penalty imposed for contempt do be jail, should be jail. Because I think a fine would diminish the seriousness of the proceeding. Jail is not a punishment for something that Mr. Cooper has It's coercion. This is not an done in the past. economic dispute. Mr. Cooper is not taking the position he is over money. It's a principled position in his mind, one with which we disagree. But at the end of the day if the D.C. Circuit agrees with Your Honor that he's obligated to testify and that the law requires that and the facts require it, that we need his testimony then an economic fine will not compel that.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

in contempt and indicating that the punishment is jail not a monetary fine that shows the seriousness of the proceeding. At the same time if we stay Mr. Cooper being in jail for an expedited schedule for the appeal, I think we accomplished what we all want to do which is to make sure we're all right on the law and that D.C. Circuit reviews it and that we can proceed in a timely fashion. I hope the record is clear from the D.C. Circuit that we're taking that view because we want to see this done appropriately, but we do want

to move with all deliberate dispatch.

And I would point out that the cases and Mr. Fleissner is more familiar with the cases generally. I was flying while the brief was served. From my understanding the cases don't involve Grand Jury matters. They involve civil matters. And I think at the end of the day if the D.C. Circuit agrees that this is a validly issued Grand Jury subpoena the only appropriate remedy to make that Mr. Cooper does testify would be jail.

THE COURT: All right. One footnote is that in the brief of the Respondent here they suggests that my original ruling be made public at this time along with all papers in connection with this motion. And any decision or oral argument or decision in this motion. In fact, that the papers do not disclose any details of the Grand Jury investigation. You all want my issue on that or not. I've already talked about publishing my opinion on Monday which I intend to do. I haven't heard any objection to that from the people involved. As to the papers in this motion --

MR. FITZGERALD: If I could say this, Your Honor and I'll have Mr. Fleissner, my lawyer, correct me if I'm wrong which he should do. My understanding generally is that even though it's a Grand Jury

matter, contempt matters are often made public. I don't believe we've said anything in our papers that would reveal the operation of the Grand Jury on the contempt.

And not having read Mr. Abrams' papers I can rely upon Mr. Fleissner who has read them this morning and Mr. Abrams that there's nothing in there, that the contempt papers we believe the motion -- all the papers filed with regard to contempt could be made public. We would obviously oppose the initial papers concerning the motion for the reasons we set forth before.

THE COURT: Your attachments?

MR. FITZGERALD: Exactly.

THE COURT: I understand that.

MR. FITZGERALD: And the prior hearing which I think would refer back to matters that were treated in confidence for purposes of litigation. That would then leave the simple question of whether or not Your Honor's opinion and order should be released today versus Monday. And on that we had moved in Monday on part on the agreement that counsel would not object. They have a right to change that so I have no complaints. And so the only question is the difference between Friday and Monday. If I can just

talk to my co-counsel for a second.

THE COURT: Yeah, that's fine. We had talked about releasing it Monday. I had not considered releasing it today. I thought Monday was the understanding. I gave everybody Monday to reject. If I hadn't heard by then I would release the opinion.

MR. FITZGERALD: Is Your Honor's intent to release it on Monday or today?

THE COURT: Monday.

MR. FITZGERALD: Okay. We would consent.

MR. ABRAMS: On that single point, Your
Honor, I think that it would be well if you are going
to release the proceedings about today that if they're
available on Monday that perhaps you would release
them all at once. Just among other things it would be
very difficult for us to, you know, answer questions
to the world about what happened next if, unless
they're both delivered to the world in the same
package if that could be accomplished.

THE COURT: I would intend to release the papers in connection with this motion and that, and then the original order and the opinion I did on July 20th at the same time. It says, "All papers in connection with this motion." There was some ex parte filing by the government originally perhaps affidavits

I would not released.

MR. ABRAMS: I'm sorry, "by this motion," I meant the order to show cause.

THE COURT: Yeah, that's no problem. Your briefs that you filed I received and the order so forth.

MR. ABRAMS: That would just be the briefs and a transcript of any of the oral argument.

THE COURT: That's fine.

MR. ABRAMS: Thank you.

MR. FITZGERALD: Your Honor, one other matter I forgot to address is we were hoping to address also the corporate entity Time, Inc. in terms of contempt. My understanding is that the corporate entity would refuse to comply.

THE COURT: That came in yesterday. Let me hear from Mr. Abrams that they were ready to address that. I did get the motion to quash I think came in yesterday.

MR. ABRAMS: In all candor, Your Honor, the motion to quash is essentially a repetition for the record of the argument we had made to you previously. Indeed, it refers back to the earlier arguments. We had thought that, and I think Special Counsel agrees with this, that it would be appropriate for both

matters to be considered by the Court of Appeals at the same time.

I think the reason we shored the subpoena was given one day's notice actually and that we extend it a few days. Ordinarily, I would argue to you that in a situation in which you haven't even entered an order to show cause I shouldn't have another client in contempt. But in all candor there's not a lot of new news in our papers to you on the, on behalf of Time.

So, so long as there's an understanding that applies to Time of the same sort that we've reached with respect to Mr. Cooper not involving incarceration of course, but involving a stay of whatever penalty Your Honor imposes, if any, and on the same terms then we don't have any problem with Your Honor ruling similarly with whatever other ruling you may reach today. As I said the reason we were obliged to file that is we had a Grand Jury subpoena. And we either had to comply with it or file a motion with respect to it.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you. And Time is represented here today?

MR. ABRAMS: Yes.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. FITZGERALD: Your Honor, we would agree

to a stay on any contempt proceeding on Time Inc.

Obviously it would be a fine. I would not like a

nominal fine, but if it expedites things I know if we
can have a fine that we can agree upon the amount to

be determined later or pick a number that's neither

low nor high and argue it later.

2.1

I guess technically, we should have, if Your Honor denies the motion to quash have Time refuse to comply with the subpoena pending appeal and then we can brief both matters with the same schedule. And then if Your Honor unsealed on Monday the relevant papers we would like the motion to quash the subpoena to be treated like a prior motion to quash and remain sealed since it contains Grand Jury matters but the discussion of this contempt would be open.

THE COURT: Let me just look at this.

MR. ABRAMS: My only interest in this Your Honor is clarity. And instead of frankly putting you in the position of having to work this out with us today or this morning it just seems to me that when Your Honor is prepared to enter whatever order or orders you enter that they should be basically consistent and that they could be entered at the same time, but probably would take two separate orders.

THE COURT: Yeah. Okay. Seems to me we

have to do, review this a little bit more but as to the second issue a motion of Time to quash subpoena protective order I just read through it again and as Mr. Fitzgerald has ably and candidly told the Court represent arguments that I've already considered in Mr. Cooper's issue is deny that motion to quash and for protective order by Time Inc. And order them to comply with the subpoena. In failing to do so would be subject to contempt. And as I understand it Time magazine will not comply with the order to compel them to testify and provide information and documents as the subpoena requests which I think is attached to Exhibit one of their motion.

Date and time is August 4th of the Grand
Jury proceedings where Time is commanded to bring
notes, tape recordings, e-mail and other documents of
Matthew Cooper in regard to the subject matter in this
investigation. And that therefore, Time's motion to
quash having been denied they could be compelled to
produce those documents. As I understand the
representations today they would not do so but be in
the same position as Mr. Cooper is today.

MR. ABRAMS: Yes, that's correct, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And therefore I would enter an

order as the same. I think I would enter a written order to that effect and then enter an order holding them in contempt if that is the reality they are refusing to comply with the subpoena that I have now ordered to be satisfied.

MR. ABRAMS: Just so the record is clear,
Your Honor, the reason for that is the same claims of
confidentiality that we have made previously to you.

THE COURT: Thank you. I see a marshal has come in the courtroom. Don't be too nervous,

Mr. Cooper. You do have your toothbrush with you?

All right. I'm ready to go ahead and rule on these matters.

In recognizing the seriousness of these issues that my ruling interpreting <u>Branzburg</u> from the Supreme Court and its progeny in the Grand Jury context at least established to the Court's satisfaction there is no First Amendment right to reporter's privilege, while recognizing in other context perhaps certain civil or even criminal cases as witnesses. There has been some perhaps balancing done by following Justice Powell's concurrence that seems to have watered down somewhat Justice White's opinion in <u>Branzburg</u> it seems to me.

But the reading I got in the Grand Jury

context is that I ruled on July 20th and nothing it seemed to me to change that which has been submitted since then. I'm satisfied under the recalcitrant witness statute 28 U.C.S. 1826 that as a witness before a Grand Jury has refused without just cause to comply with an order of the Court to testify, the Court refuse to be brought to its attention which it now has summarily ordered his confinement in a suitable place until such time the witness is willing to give such information and provide such information.

The Court has the discretion of using criminal or civil contempt obviously to address the violation of its order. And Mr. Cooper has stated he has violated the Court's order and will not obey it and I make such a finding. In Re Investigation before April 1975 Grand Jury at 531 F.2nd at 608, a D.C. Circuit case from '76, recognized that the Court can go either civil or criminal contempt. Criminal contempt is 18 U.S.C. 401 and 402.

But the cases suggest that normally the Court should consider the feasibility of coercing testimony through the imposition of civil contempt and should only resort to criminal contempt after it determines that the remedy, any civil remedy would be inappropriate, perhaps ineffectual, that's Shillitani

versus U.S. at 384 U.S. 371 Footnote nine.

The Court is going to go by way of civil contempt in this matter. And I can order a fine or order imposition of confinement until the witness agrees to provide the requested testimony. I do not think it would be appropriate not to issue any order and to waive any penalties in this matter because Mr. Cooper has refused to obey the order of the Court and now Time magazine as well.

I don't know the length of this Grand Jury whether it's going to be extended or not. And the timing is a concern to the government because the statute provides he can be held only during the length of the service of the Grand Jury as a maximum. But looking at the issues in this case it's clear to the Court as a matter of principle and it is not one of in any way of attempting to frustrate the rule of the law but to have the appropriate legal authorities rule upon this in a more final fashion in the District Court.

So what the Court will do at this time I'm going to find Mr. Cooper in contempt and Time magazine based upon the oral orders I've issued now and the rulings I've made which will be put forth in a written order for its failure to respond to the subpoena that

is, I've upheld and ordered them to do based upon their representation of counsel, corporate counsel as well as Mr. Abrams states that Time magazine will also not comply with the Court's order. Find them in contempt of court, civil contempt of court under 28 U.C.S. 1826, and apply the following rule to attempt to address the violation of this order and compel the testimony through the imposition of this civil contempt.

The Court will first confine Mr. Cooper at a suitable place until the witness agrees to provide the requested testimony. And the confinement will last no longer than the term of the Grand Jury or 18 months whichever is shorter. The Court will suspend that confinement pending the appeal of this case and grant a stay finding that there's substantial legal questions involved that the contempt is a matter of principle and not being contemptuous quote to the Court because of the refusal to answer the questions in light of Mr. Cooper's belief that the law provides the privilege to him not to provide off-the-record or confidential information from sources in his field as a reporter and the First Amendment protections that he has.

And that it is important for the appellate

process to go forward quickly because of the nature of the investigations, the Grand Jury investigations with limited time frame. The government's established in its various proceedings before this Court that it is necessary to proceed this way. They have done all other efforts they can do to get this information from other individuals and have not been able to finally make the determinations they need to make to proceed in this case without this information. And it is a matter of time because they have basically indicated they have finished much of their investigation except for these matters involving reporters and their employers to provide the last information they need to close this investigation one way or another.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2.5

I will not go any further in details about that. The record will be clear to the Court of Appeals, I believe. I'm not finding Mr. Cooper has not been acting in good faith, but these are a matter of professional conscience. And therefore, I think the stay of his imprisonment is appropriate until such time as the Court of Appeals rules as long as they move this matter expediously and not delay the case undue amount of time so that the investigation would be harmed.

And it's certainly in the public interest to

certify the entry of the stay given the serious First

Amendment issues in this case and any potential

chilling effect which contempt sanctions will have on

reporters working on matters of public interest and on

their employers such as Time magazine.

And I agree with the parties that public and the criminal process in a Grand Jury both will be well served by having legal issues in this case conclusively resolved before any contempt sanction is effected against Mr. Cooper. One has been granted now but not effected.

So for those reasons this will be a bench opinion of the Court. And that I will stay the contempt penalties against Mr. Cooper pending determination of the First Amendment issues raised in this case by the D.C. Circuit. And additionally, as to Time magazine I will issue a monetary fine on a daily basis. Couple of cases I have here, on a daily basis of one thousand dollars a day which is more symbolic of a penalty to a large corporate enterprise like Time magazine. But it does provide a contempt citation against them as a vehicle there for them to appeal this finding of contempt refusing to comply with the Grand Jury subpoena to provide the necessary testimony/documentary evidence as required by my court

order today. Relying upon my original memorandum opinion of July 20th, 2004.

2.5

As to Mr. Cooper, he'll be granting personal recognizance bail today so that he will be released unless the parties have some understanding of the situation. It seems to me he should be put on personal recognizance with no conditions other than remains available depending on what happens with the Court of Appeals. There should be no other conditions upon him.

I would like the government to propose, to file an order incorporating these findings that also have been reviewed by Mr. Abrams before it is entered. And I would like it provided to me this afternoon so that I may go ahead and issue this as soon as possible. And then issue my opinions and the briefs for today's hearing, order to show cause to be released to the public Monday morning. All right, Mr. Abrams.

MR. ABRAMS: Your Honor, the only thing I didn't hear you may have said you are staying the penalty imposed on Time as well as on Mr. Cooper.

THE COURT: I did not say that. I meant to, thank you, yes. The Time magazine penalty of a thousand dollars a day will be stayed pending the

appeal as well finding the same factors and granting a stay apply to Time magazine and the public interest as well in the nature of this case. And the expedited appeal process and the significant legal issues that need be decided all will take a favor of granting a stay of Mr. Cooper's penalty but also Time magazine.

MR. FITZGERALD: Lastly, judge, I take it the order should also provide that the, while the motion to quash, the papers filed with regard to the motion to quash shall remain sealed except for the ordered opinion, that the papers concerning the motion for contempt will be unsealed. And that today's proceeding will be unsealed, but the argument on the motion to quash will remain sealed.

THE COURT: Yes, the motion to quash will remain sealed.

MR. FITZGERALD: To be even more clear the motion to quash with regard to Mr. Cooper would remain sealed since we discussed sensitive matters, but since today I think we were careful the motion to quash with regard to Time, Inc. can be I believe unsealed.

THE COURT: All right. That's fine. I think I would also want separate orders from Time magazine denying the motion to quash; of course, my oral ruling this morning and refusing to answer the

subpoena at that point and them being held and now held in contempt. I think there should probably separate orders done.

My clerk had brought up a good point. The motion to quash for Time attaches the motion to quash of Mr. Cooper's, and the, aside from briefing the affidavit of Mr. Cooper and Mr. Abrams's affidavit. In other words, you basically have just a two page cover argument and then attaches what has already been filed.

MR. FITZGERALD: Perhaps I confused everyone

THE COURT: So that we release that and I'm releasing Mr. Cooper's motion.

MR. FITZGERALD: What I meant to say which is not what I said was that the papers with regard to all the motions to quash will remain sealed and just that the entire proceedings today, the argument oral could be unsealed even though it makes reference to the motion to quash.

THE COURT: But not the actual motions to quash?

MR. FITZGERALD: Exactly.

THE COURT: I misunderstood.

MR. FITZGERALD: No, I misspoke. Thank you.

2.0

THE COURT: The other thing is I don't know what capabilities you have here in town. Can you submit a written order also in written as well as a disc form in case I want to make any changes to it? It would be easier for me.

MR. FITZGERALD: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Finally as to the bond for Mr. Cooper, I think it would probably be enough because the bond forms that we have are all criminal bond forms. This is a civil contempt. If he just supplies the Court with his name and address and I'll put down a condition. And I'll do a short order just saying he's released on his personal recognizance. He promises to reappear as required by the Court or the parties or the government at an appropriate time and place once the case is decided by the circuit and leave it at that and have Mr. Cooper sign off on that as well.

MR. FITZGERALD: We certainly agree. We don't see any need to have Mr. Cooper processed in any fashion.

THE COURT: This should not be in the order.

MR. FITZGERALD: And we certainly agree to
personal recognizance.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. ABRAMS: You want his name and address 1 on the record now, Your Honor? 2 THE COURT: Yes. And Mr. Cooper, you around 3 Are you from here or New York? 4 here? THE WITNESS: I live here in Washington. 5 THE COURT: All right. You may have to come 6 by and sign this form when I dictate it this afternoon 7 or Monday or some time that's convenient. 8 9 THE WITNESS: Sure. THE COURT: Would you take down his name and 10 11 address. THE WITNESS: I'm scheduled to be out of 12 town next week, but so it's possible to do it today. 13 MR. ABRAMS: You want to use your office 14 address? Is that satisfactory? 15 THE COURT: Yes. 16 MR. ABRAMS: Why don't you give your name 17 and office address. 18 19 THE WITNESS: Sure. My name is Matthew My office address is Time magazine, 555 12th 20 Street, Northwest, Suite 600, Washington, D.C. 21 22 zip code is 20004. 23 THE COURT: All right. I'll dictate a short

order for that. You'll be here for another half hour

so you can come by and sign the order.

24

25

THE WITNESS: Thank you, Your Honor. I appreciate that. Phone is 202 861-4046.

MR. FITZGERALD: Thank you, judge. We appreciate your seeing us on short notice with the trial underway.

THE COURT: Thank you all for coming in. I appreciate it. I'll get that first order out. And I'll wait for the government to submit the other ones. Monday morning we'll release the order so that Time can talk to its constituency about this.

[Thereupon, the proceedings adjourned at 10:46 a.m.]

CERTIFICATE

I, Cathryn J. Jones, an Official Court
Reporter for the United States District Court of the
District of Columbia, do hereby certify that I
reported, by machine shorthand, the proceedings had
and testimony adduced=in the above case.

I further certify that the forgoing 36 pages constitute the official transcript of said proceedings as transcribed from my machine shorthand notes.

In witness whereof, I have hereto subscribed my name, this the 16th day of August, 2004.

Cathryn J. Jones, RPR Official Court Reporter